UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,454	12/20/2005	Carlos Antonio Alba Pinto	NL 030726	6437
	7590 06/08/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			PETRANEK, JACOB ANDREW	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2183	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/561,454	ALBA PINTO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Gases I Charlet	2100
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>5/26/2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLC	DWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	•	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ vw);	ΓE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a factorial content of the conte		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.4-8 and 10-12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails to provide a ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Eddie P Chan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2183		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment to claim 12 corrects a claim objection and will be entered for purposes of appeal.

Applicant argues "Sih's multiply, shift, and add elements within each parallel MAC cannot operate at sub-optimal clock rates and still provide their intended high-speed multiply-accumulate (MAC) function. They must each perform their respective function within one instruction cycle, and that cycle should not be lengthened by the inclusion of an unnecessary latency in any of these functions." and "Given that the purpose of Sih's design is to provide high-speed MAC operations, one of skill in the art would optimize all of the elements along the critical path subject to a given set of design constraints. One of skill in the art would not be motivated to apply techniques that only provide an advantage for latency-tolerant elements to Sih's latency-intolerant multiply, shift, and add elements, as asserted by the Examiner." The applicant is generally correct in the statements that Sager achieves decreased chip space usage and power savings by placing elements outside of the critical path area. This fact was the reason that was given as motivation for the combination of Sager with Sih and Hennessy. The applicant also stated that the MAC operations are required to execute in a single clock cycle. Thus, the applicant is stating that the dual-mac and single-mac instructions are required to execute in a single cycle. The clock cycle rate would be set according to the dual-MAC instruction, which has a longer critical path latency than the single-MAC instruction. Thus, the single-MAC instruction is finished executing well before the clock cycle period has ended. Thus, placing this functionality off on a less-critical path with a lower clock cycle would lead to less power consumption and chip space usage, while not allowing for too much performance degradation. Therefore, there is proper motivation to combine the references together.